

Survey response for Italy

OECD database of governance of public research policy

This document contains detailed responses for Italy to the survey on governance of public research policy across the OECD. It provides additional background information to the OECD database of governance of public research policy as described in Borowiecki, M. and C. Paunov (2018), "How is research policy across the OECD organised? Insights from a new policy database", *OECD Science, Technology and Industry Policy Papers*, No. 55, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/235c9806-en>. The data was compiled by the OECD Working Party on Innovation and Technology Policy (TIP). Data quality was validated by delegates to OECD TIP Working Party the in the period between March 2017 and May 2018. Additional references that were used to fill out the questionnaire are indicated.

The data is made freely available online for download at <https://stip.oecd.org/resgov>.

Contact:

Caroline Paunov, Senior Economist, E-mail: Caroline.Paunov@oecd.org;

Martin Borowiecki, Junior Economist, E-mail: Martin.Borowiecki@oecd.org

Abbreviations and acronyms

ANVUR	Agenzia Nazionale di Valutazione del Sistema Universitario e della Ricerca National Agency for Evaluation of Universities and Research Institutes
CIPE	Inter-Ministerial Committee for Economic Planning
CIVIT	Independent Commission for the Evaluation of Transparency and Integrity of Public Administrations
CNR	Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche National Research Council
CRUI	Conference of Italian University Rectors
FFO	Fondo per il Finanziamento Ordinario Ordinary Fund for Universities
HEIs	Higher Education Institutions
MISE	Ministero dello Sviluppo Economico Ministry of Economic Development
MIUR	Ministero dell Istruzione, dell Università e della Ricerca Ministry of Education, University and Research
PNR	Programma Nazionale per la Ricerca National Research Programme
PRIs	Public Research Institutes
SMEs	Small and medium-sized enterprises
SIR	Scientific Independence of young Researchers Programme

Survey of public research policy

Topic 1: Institutions in charge of priority setting, funding and evaluations

Table 1. Questions on institutions in charge of priority setting, funding and evaluations of universities and PRIs

Question	Response
<p>Q.1.1. Who mainly decides on the scientific, sectoral and/or thematic priorities of budget allocations for a) HEIs and b) PRIs?</p> <p>c) Which are the main mechanisms in place to decide on scientific, sectoral and/or thematic priorities of national importance, e.g. digital transition, sustainability? Please describe who is involved and who decides on the priorities (e.g., government, research and innovation councils, sector-specific platforms including industry and science, etc.). <i>(This question does not refer to who sets overall science, technology and industry priorities. This is usually done by parliaments and government. The question refers to decisions taken after budgets to different ministries/agencies have been approved. Scientific priorities refer to scientific disciplines, e.g. biotechnology; sectoral priorities refer to industries, e.g. pharmaceuticals; and thematic priorities refer to broader social themes, e.g. digital transition, sustainability, etc.)</i></p> <p>d) From 2005-16, were any significant changes introduced as to how decisions on scientific, sectoral and/or thematic orientation of major programmes are taken (e.g. establishment of agencies that decide on content of programmes)?</p> <p>References: EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Italy. Responses A2 and B4.</p>	<p>a and b) The Ministry of Education, University and Research (MIUR) takes decisions concerning all HEIs and most PRIs. Some PRIs are under the responsibility of other Ministries, including the Ministry of Economic Development (MISE).</p> <p>c) Missing answer</p> <p>d) <i>Changes over 2005-16</i> The MIUR was created in 2008 and is in charge of coordinating and financing the research, technological development and innovation system (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, responses A2 and B4).</p>
<p>Q.1.2. Who allocates institutional block funding to a) HEIs and b) PRIs? <i>(Institutional block funds (or to general university funds) support institutions and are usually transferred directly from the government budget.)</i></p> <p>c) Who allocates project-based funding of research and/or innovation for HEIs and PRIs? <i>(Project-based funding provides support for research and innovation activities on the basis of competitive bids.)</i></p> <p>d) Is there a transnational body that provides funding to HEIs and PRIs (e.g. the European Research Council)?</p> <p>e) What is the importance of such funding relative to national funding support?</p> <p>f) From 2005-16, were any changes made to way programmes are developed and funding is allocated to HEIs and PRIs (e.g. merger of agencies, devolution of programme management from ministries to agencies)?</p> <p>References: EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Italy. Responses A2, B4, B7.</p>	<p>a and b) Ministries allocate institutional funding to HEIs and PRIs, mainly the MIUR, but also the MISE, the Ministry of Health, Ministry of Agricultural ReReferences, the Ministry of Defence, among others.</p> <p>c) Funds for research and/or innovation projects, i.e. open calls, are allocated by the MISE and the MIUR (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, responses A2 and B4).</p> <p>d) HEIs and PRIs are also eligible for additional funding from the European Research Council and the European Union.</p> <p>e) Missing answer.</p> <p>f) No major changes made.</p>

<p>Q.1.3. Do performance contracts determine funding of a) HEIs?</p>	<p>a to f) Performance contracts between the Ministry and HEIs are not in place.</p>
<p><i>Institutional block funds can be partly or wholly distributed based on performance. (Performance contracts define goals agreed between ministry/agency and HEIs/PRIs and link it to future block funding of HEIs and PRIs.)</i></p>	<p>g) Performance-based elements of university funding are in place. A proportion between 20% and 30% of university funds is linked to the assessment of a set of criteria defined by the National Agency for Evaluation of University and Research (ANVUR) which are mainly linked to bibliometric parameters, but include also other parameters (e.g. student services, international dimension, knowledge transfer activities etc.)</p>
<p>b) What is the share of HEI budget subject to performance contract?</p>	<p>h) <i>Changes over 2005-2016</i></p>
<p>c) Do performance contracts include quantitative indicators for monitoring and evaluation?</p>	<p>Since 1994, there are three main References of university funding: the Ordinary Fund for Universities (Fondo per il Finanziamento Ordinario); the Fund for the Multiannual Planning (Fondo per la Programmazione triennale); and the Fund for University Infrastructure (Fondo per l'edilizia universitaria).</p>
<p>d) What are the main indicators used in performance contracts? Which, if any, performance aside from research and education is set out in performance contracts?</p>	<p>While the second and the third have always been distributed on a competitive basis, the FFO has been allocated for a long time based on historical allocation quota and partially on performance indicators. Since 2009, the share of FFO distributed on a competitive basis has increased to 12% in 2011 and 18% in 2015 (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response C4).</p>
<p>e) Do HEIs participate in the formulation of main priorities and criteria used in performance contracts?</p>	<p>In 2009, evaluations of research institutions (both HEIs and PRIs) were introduced to allocate a significant share of their funding allocation (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response C4).</p>
<p>f) Do the same priorities and criteria set in performance contracts apply to all HEIs?</p>	<p>In 2012 the government decided to gradually increase the share of performance-based funding and to replace the historical allocation by an allocation based on the standard cost per student as of 2014. The aim was to mitigate inequalities of the historical allocation whereby universities of the same size and profile received different amounts of public funds per student in the standard period.</p>
<p>g) Are any other mechanisms in place to allocate funding to HEIs and PRIs?</p>	<p>Evaluations of Italian HEIs and PRIs are conducted every two years. The results of such evaluations affect the distribution of public funds for HEIs and PRIs (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, responses B11, B12_d, B13). Evaluations focus on enrolments, courses and outcomes in academic studies, number of researchers, the expenditure level of universities, the quality of the offered training, but also institutional issues, national and EU funding, and the international positioning of the Italian research system (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response B13).</p>
<p>h) From 2005-16, were any changes made to funding of HEIs and PRIs?</p>	<p>The evaluation of the Public Research Institutions and universities is actually a work in progress, with a considerable part of this first exercise devoted to the testing of different performance criteria (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response B12_d).</p>
<p><i>(In case performance contracts are in place that bind funding of PRIs, please provide information about them.)</i></p>	

References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Italy. Response C4.

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Italy. Response B12_d.

Valutazioni - ANVUR (2016). Available at:

http://www.anvur.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=19&Itemid=114&lang=it (Accessed: 13 October 2016).

Q.1.4. Who decides on the following key **evaluation** criteria of HEIs and PRIs?

Who is responsible for setting criteria to use when evaluating performance of a) HEIs? Who is responsible for b) evaluating and c) monitoring HEIs' performance?

Who is responsible for setting criteria to use when evaluating performance of d) PRIs? Who is responsible for e) evaluating and f) monitoring PRIs' performance?

h) From 2005-16, was any institution created for evaluating HEIs and PRIs or were any changes made to criteria applied for evaluations of HEIs and PRIs?

a to f) The National Agency for Evaluation of Universities and Research Institutes (ANVUR) defines performance criteria to be used for evaluations of HEIs and PRIs and conducts the evaluations of their performance.

The Agency establishes autonomously the criteria of evaluations. Performance indicators, targets, and evaluation criteria for HEIs and PRIs are defined in the ANVUR Performance Plan and Legislative Decree 150/2009. The current performance plan for the period 2013-15 also takes into account the indications provided on this matter by the Independent Commission for the Evaluation of Transparency and Integrity of Public Administrations (CIVIT) (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response B12_d).

h) *Changes over 2005-2016*

ANVUR was established in 2010. ANVUR is an independent Agency under the supervision of MIUR.

References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Italy. Responses B11, B12_d, B13.

Q.1.5. Which **recent reforms** to institutions that are in charge of priority setting, budget allocations, and evaluations of HEIs and PRIs were particularly important?

The National Agency for Evaluation of Universities and Research Institutes (ANVUR) was established in 2010. Its evaluations affect the allocation of public funds.

Topic 2: Policy co-ordination mechanisms

Table 2. Questions on research and innovation councils

Question	Response
<p>Q.2.1. a) Is there a Research and Innovation Council, i.e. non-temporary public body that takes decisions concerning HEI and PRI policy, and that has explicit mandates by law or in its statutes to either?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – provide policy advice (i.e. produce reports); – and/or oversee policy evaluation; – and/or coordinate policy areas relevant to public research (e.g. across ministries and agencies); – and/or set policy priorities (i.e. strategy development, policy guidelines); – and/or joint policy planning (e.g. joint cross-ministry preparation of budgetary allocations)? <p>b) What is the name of the main research and/or innovation Council/Committee? Are there any other research Councils/Committees?</p> <p>c) Are there any other research Councils/Committees?</p>	<p>a to c) There are no research and innovation councils in place. Ministries (MIUR, MISE) provide advice on reforms and policies.</p>
<p>Q.2.2. With reference to Q.2.1, does the Council's mandate explicitly include a) policy coordination; b) preparation of strategic priorities; c) decision-making on budgetary allocations; d) evaluation of policies' implementation (including their enforcement); e) and provision of policy advice?</p>	<p>a to e) There are no research and innovation councils in place.</p>
<p>Q.2.3. With reference to Q.2.1, who formally participates in the Council? a) Head of State, b) ministers, c) government officials (civil servants and other representatives of ministries, agencies and implementing bodies), d) funding agency representatives, e) local and regional government representatives, f) HEI representatives, g) PRI representatives, h) private sector, i) civil society, and/or j) foreign experts</p>	<p>a to j) There are no research and innovation councils in place.</p>
<p>Q.2.4. With reference to Q.2.1.b., does the Council have its own a) staff and/or its own b) budget? If so, please indicate the number of staff and the amount of annual budget available.</p> <p>c) From 2005-16, were any reforms made to the mandate of the Council, its functions, the composition of the Council, the budget and/or the Council's secretariat? Was the Council created during the time period?</p>	<p>a to c) There are no research and innovation councils in place.</p>

Table 3. Questions on national STI strategies

Question	Response
<p>Q.2.5. a) Is there a national non-sectoral STI strategy or plan?</p> <p>b) What is the name of the main national STI strategy or plan?</p>	<p>a and b) There is no main national STI strategy in place in Italy. A number of national-level strategies exist: National Research Plan (NRP) for 2014-2020; Horizon 2020 Italia (2014-2020); and the National Smart Specialisation Strategy (2014-2020)</p> <p>The National Research Plan (NRP) for 2014-2020 is in place since the end of 2013. The NRP 2014-2020 is a 7-year plan that defines objectives and modes of implementation of all public research activities in Italy. Performance based funding of HEIs provided by the Ordinary Fund is aligned to the guidelines outlined in NRP (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response A2).</p> <p>Besides the NRP, there are additional strategies in place: Horizon 2020 Italia (2014-2020); and the National Smart Specialization Strategy (2014-2020).</p>
<p><i>References:</i></p>	
<p>EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Italy. Response A2.</p>	
<p>Q.2.6. Does the national STI strategy or plan address any of the following priorities?</p> <p>a) Specific themes and/or societal challenges (e.g. Industry 4.0; “green innovation”; health; environment; demographic change and wellbeing; efficient energy; climate action) - Which of the following themes and/or societal challenges are addressed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Demographic change (i.e. ageing populations, etc.) – Digital economy (e.g. big data, digitalisation, industry 4.0) – Green economy (e.g. natural reReferences, energy, environment, climate change) – Health (e.g. Bioeconomy, life science) – Mobility (e.g. transport, smart integrated transport systems, e-mobility) – Smart cities (e.g. sustainable urban systems urban development) <p>b) Specific scientific disciplines and technologies (e.g. ICT; nanotechnologies; biotechnology) - Which of the following scientific research, technologies and economic fields are addressed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Agriculture and agricultural technologies – Energy and energy technologies (e.g. energy storage, environmental technologies) – Health and life sciences (e.g. biotechnology, medical technologies) – ICT (e.g. artificial intelligence, digital platforms, data privacy) – Nanotechnology and advanced manufacturing (e.g. robotics, autonomous systems) 	<p>a) The NRP addresses specific themes and/or societal challenges: Energy efficiency; sustainable mobility; new technologies for “Made in Italy”; technologies for the cultural heritage; human capital; and internationalisation (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, responses A2, B1, B4).</p> <p>b) The National Smart Specialization Strategy addresses specific scientific research, technologies and economic fields. (no order of preference): life sciences; agri-food; quality of life/smart and sustainable industry, energy and environment/tourism; cultural heritage and creativity industry/digital agenda; smart communities; smart mobility systems and aerospace and defence (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, responses A2, B1, B4)</p> <p>STI Policy Survey 2016, responses A2, B1, B4).</p>

c) Specific regions (e.g. smart specialisation strategies)	c) NRP and the National Smart Specialization Strategy address specific regions. NRP focuses on the potential of Southern Italy.
d) Supranational or transnational objectives set by transnational institutions (for instance related to European Horizon 2020)	The National Smart Specialization Strategy addresses (no order of preference) a number of sectors in Piemonte, Lombardia, Umbria, Lazio, Puglia, Campania, Sardegna, Emilia Romagna, and Toscana. (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Italy. Responses A2, B1, B4).
e) Quantitative targets for monitoring and evaluation (e.g. setting as targets a certain level of R&D spending for public research etc.)	d) Horizon 2020 Italia addresses the global competitiveness of the European research system as a supranational or transnational objective.
f) From 2005-16, was any STI strategy introduced or were any changes made existing STI strategies?	e) Both NRP and Horizon 2020 Italia set quantitative targets for monitoring and evaluation: to increase R&D expenditures to 1.53% of GDP by 2020 (NRP); to increase EU Structural Funds for innovation acquired by Italian actors by 50% in the next programming cycle 2014-2020 (Horizon 2020 Italia) (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, responses A2 and B1).
	f) <i>Changes over 2005-2016</i> The National Research Plan (NRP) for 2014-2020 was created in 2013 and the National Smart Specialisation Strategy was launched in 2014. The strategy Horizon 2020 Italia was launched in 2014. (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, responses A2, B1, B4).

References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Italy. Responses A2, B1, B4.

p. 10, pp. 51-52 Invitalia. 2016. *Accompagnamento All'attuazione Delle Politiche Nazionali E Regionali Di Ricerca E Innovazione 2014-2020 (Smart Specialisation Strategy - S3)*.

https://www.researchitaly.it/uploads/7553/Report_di_analisi_12_Aree_di_specializzazione.pdf?v=26a4e6c,

p. 27 Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca (2013) 'Horizon 2020 Italia'. Available at:

<https://www.researchitaly.it/uploads/50/HIT2020.pdf> (Accessed: 11 October 2016).

Q.2.7. What **reforms** to policy co-ordination regarding STI strategies and plans have had particular impact on public research policy? No major reforms made.

Table 4. Questions on inter-agency programming and role of agencies

Question	Response
<p>Q.2.8. Does inter-agency joint programming contribute to the co-ordination of HEI and PRI policy?</p> <p><i>(Inter-agency joint programming refers to formal arrangements that result in joint action by implementing agencies, such as e.g. sectoral funding programmes or other joint policy instrument initiatives between funding agencies.)</i></p>	Inter-agency programming is not in place. A certain (limited) degree of co-ordination is assured by the Inter-Ministerial Committee for Economic Planning (CIPE).
<p>Q.2.9. a) Is co-ordination within the mandate of agencies?</p> <p>b) From 2005-16, were any changes made to the mandates of agencies tasked with regards to inter-agency programming? Were new agencies created with the task to coordinate programming during the time period?</p>	<p>a) Agencies do not have the mandate for co-ordination. A certain (limited) degree of co-ordination is assured by the Inter-Ministerial Committee for Economic Planning (CIPE).</p> <p>b) No major changes made.</p>
<p>Q.2.10. What reforms of the institutional context have had impacts on public research policy?</p>	No major reforms made.

Topic 3: Stakeholders consultation and institutional autonomy

Table 5. Questions on stakeholder consultation

Question	Response
<p>Q.3.1. a) Do the following stakeholders participate as formal members in Research and Innovation Councils? <i>(i.e. Formal membership as provided by statutes of Council)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Private Sector - Civil society (citizens/ NGOs/ foundations) - HEIs/PRI and/or their associations <p>b) Do stakeholders participate as formal members in council/governing boards of HEIs? <i>(i.e. Formal membership as provided by statutes of Council)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Private Sector - Civil society (citizens/ NGOs/ foundations) 	<p>a) There is no research and innovation council in Italy.</p> <p>b) Representatives from civil society, HEIs and PRIs participate as formal members of Council/governing boards of HEIs and PRIs.</p>
<p><i>References:</i></p> <p>Board of Governors - University of Bologna (2016). Available at: http://www.unibo.it/en/university/organization/university-governing-bodies/board-of-governors (Accessed: 14 October 2016).</p> <p>Council - University of Siena (2016). Available at: http://en.unisi.it/university/governance/council (Accessed: 14 October 2016).</p> <p>People - The Istituto di Radioastronomia (2016). Available at: https://www.ira.inaf.it/People.html (Accessed: 14 October 2016).</p> <p>IBF Advisory Board Istituto di Biofisica (no date). Available at: http://www.ibf.cnr.it/en/node/132 (Accessed: 14 October 2016).</p> <p>Governance — Cira (2016). Available at: http://www.cira.it/en/chi-siamo-en/organi-societari (Accessed: 14 October 2016).</p>	

<p>Q.3.2.a) Are there online consultation platforms in place to request inputs regarding HEI and PRI policy? b) Which aspects do these online platforms address (e.g. e.g. open data, open science)?</p>	<p>a) Online platforms are established on an ad hoc basis (e.g. the consultation that preceded the design of the PNR in 2013, the consultation on shaping the future Framework Programme) using the supercomputing facilities of the CINECA, the main country's ICT facility.</p>
<p>c) From 2005-16, were any reforms made to widen inclusion of stakeholders and/or to improve consultations, including online platforms?</p>	<p>c) <i>Changes over 2005-2016</i> CINECA Cineca is the most powerful supercomputing facility in Italy. Cineca is a non-profit consortium, made up of 70 Italian universities, four national research centres, and the Ministry of Universities and Research (MIUR), and was established in 1969. It offers support to the research activities of the scientific community through supercomputing and its applications. In the last decade, Cineca has assumed the role of "operational technical arm" for MIUR, which allows the interaction of all components of the academic world with the central administration, guaranteeing the Ministry constant monitoring of the processes and the coordination of all of the activities.</p> <p>OPEN GOVERNMENT ITALIA 2016-2018 The 3rd Plan for the period 2016-2018 of the Minister for Simplification and Public Administration defines tools to strengthen public consultations to support the decision-making processes involved in the Italian Public. The goal is to improve the quality of decision-making processes, to ensure that the commitments made by the various administrations are respected and thus to increase trust in institutions.</p> <p>NATIONAL RESEARCH PROGRAMME (PNR) 2015-2020 The PNR intends to support a process of permanent stakeholder engagement, "which integrates the national and regional dimension of research policies to ensure coordination, monitoring and impact assessment of policies". National Technology Clusters will play a significant role to broaden stakeholder engagement. They are supposed to become permanent infrastructures for dialogue between universities, public research organizations and businesses, and between National and Regional administrations.</p>
<p>Q.3.3. Which reforms to consultation processes have proven particularly important?</p>	<p>No major reforms made.</p>

Table 6. Questions on autonomy of universities and PRIs

Question	Response
<p>Q.3.4. Who decides about allocations of institutional block funding for teaching, research and innovation activities at a) HEIs and b) PRIs? <i>(National/regional level: If HEIs face national constraints on using block funds, i.e. funds cannot be moved between categories such as teaching, research, infrastructure, operational costs, etc. This option also applies if the ministry pre-allocates budgets for universities to cost items, and HEIs are unable to distribute their funds between these.</i> <i>Institutions themselves: If HEIs are entirely free to use their block grants.)</i></p> <p>References: Data on institutional autonomy is based on a survey conducted by the European University Association between 2010 and 2011 across 26 European countries. The answers were provided by Secretaries General of national rectors' conferences and can be found in the report by the European University Association (Estermann et al., 2015). Estermann, T., Nokkala, T., and Steinle, M. (2015), p. 30. University Autonomy in Europe II The Scorecard. Brussels: European University Association. Retrieved from http://www.eua.be/Libraries/publications/University_Autonomy_in_Europe_II_-_The_Scorecard.pdf?sfvrsn=2, accessed 19.09.2016. European University Association (2016). University Autonomy in Europe (Webpage). Retrieved from http://www.university-autonomy.eu/, accessed 19.09.2016.</p>	<p>a and b) In Italy, institutions themselves decide about allocations of institutional block funding to internal teaching, research and innovation activities.</p>
<p>Q.3.5. Who decides about recruitment of academic staff at a) HEIs and b) PRIs? <i>(National/regional level: If recruitment needs to be confirmed by an external national/regional authority; if the number of posts is regulated by an external authority; or if candidates require prior accreditation. This option also applies if there are national/regional laws or guidelines regarding the selection procedure or basic qualifications for senior academic staff.</i> <i>Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to hire academic staff. This option also applies to cases where laws or guidelines require the institutions to publish open positions or the composition of the selection committees which are not a constraint on the hiring decision itself.)</i></p> <p>Who decides about salaries of academic staff at c) HEIs and d) PRIs? <i>(National/regional level: If salary bands are negotiated with other parties, if national civil servant or public sector status/law applies; or if external authority sets salary bands.</i> <i>Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to set salaries, except minimum wage.)</i></p> <p>Who decides about reassignments and promotions of academic staff at e) HEIs and f) PRIs? <i>(National/regional level: If promotions are only possible in case of an open post at a higher level; if a promotion committee whose composition is regulated by law has to approve the promotion; if there are requirements on minimum years of service in academia; if automatic promotions apply after certain years in office, or if there are promotion quotas.</i> <i>Institutions themselves: If HEIs can promote and reassign staff freely.)</i></p>	<p>a and b) HEIs and PRIs themselves decide about recruitment of academic staff (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response C4).</p> <p>c) With regard to the decisions about salaries of academic staff, the Law 1/2009 and the Decree Law 78/2010 require an evaluation of university researchers and professors for a wage raise (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, responses C4, H4).</p> <p>d) PRIs being constitutionally independent operate under the general supervision of MIUR and therefore themselves decide about the salaries of academic staff (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response C4).</p> <p>e) With regard to the decisions about reassignments and promotions of academic staff at HEIs, certain restrictions exist at the national level. Moreover, during 2011-2013, the salary and career progression of academics has been frozen as a measure to contain public expenditure (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response C4).</p> <p>f) PRIs themselves decide about reassignments and promotions of academic staff (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response C4).</p>

References:

Estermann et al (2015), University Autonomy in Europe II The Scorecard, pp. 38, 41. Retrieved from http://www.eua.be/Libraries/publications/University_Autonomy_in_Europe_II_-_The_Scorecard.pdf?sfvrsn=2, accessed 19.09.2016.

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Italy. Response C4.

Q.3.6. Who decides about the **creation of academic departments** (such as research centres in specific fields) and functional units (e.g. **technology transfer offices**) at a) HEIs and b) PRIs?

(National/regional level: If there are national guidelines or laws on the competencies, names, or governing bodies of internal structures, such as departments or if prior accreditation is required for the opening, closure, restructuring of departments, faculties, technology offices, etc.

Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to determine internal structures, including the opening, closure, restructuring of departments, faculties, technology offices, etc.)

Who decides about the creation of legal entities (e.g. **spin-offs**) and **industry partnerships** at c) HEIs and d) PRIs?

(National/regional level: If there are restrictions on legal entities, including opening, closure, and restructuring thereof; if restrictions apply on profit and scope of activity of non-profit organisations, for-profit spin-offs, joint R&D, etc.

Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to create non-profit organisations, for-profit spin-offs, joint R&D, etc.)

References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Italy. Response C4.

Estermann et al (2015) University Autonomy in Europe II The Scorecard, pp. 23, 24 . Retrieved from http://www.eua.be/Libraries/publications/University_Autonomy_in_Europe_II_-_The_Scorecard.pdf?sfvrsn=2, accessed 19.09.2016.

Q.3.7. Who earns what **share of revenues** stemming from IP (patents, trademarks, design rights, etc.) created from publicly funded research at a) HEIs and b) PRIs?

- HEI
- Research unit / laboratory within HEI
- Researchers

c) From 2005-16, were any reforms introduced that affected the institutional autonomy of HEIs and PRIs?

a) While University Law does not explicitly specify the number and name of academic units, other restrictions apply. The law states that universities must have faculties and departments and describes their competencies (Estermann et al., 2015, p. 23).

b) PRIs themselves decide about internal academic structures (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response C4).

c) HEIs are able to create both for-profit and not-for-profit entities (Estermann et al., 2015, p. 24).

d) PRIs themselves decide about the creation of legal entities and industry partnerships (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response C4).

a and b) Researchers at HEIs and PRIs are the owners of inventions stemming from public funded research. This issue is regulated by the art. 65 of the Code for Industrial Property, items 1, 2, 3, of the Legislative Decree February 10, 2005, n. 30:

1. Notwithstanding article 64, where the employment relationship is with a university or a public authority with its institutional aims for research purposes, the researcher shall have sole right of the rights deriving from the patentable invention of which he is the author. In the case of multiple authors, university employees, public administrations or other public administrations, the rights deriving from the invention belong to everyone in equal parts, unless otherwise agreed. The inventor submits the patent application and communicates it to the administration.

2. Universities and public administrations, within the framework of their autonomy, shall set the maximum amount of the fee for licenses to third parties for the use of the invention, due to the same university or to the public administration or private research, as well as any further aspect of mutual relations.

3. In any case, the inventor is entitled to no less than fifty percent of the proceeds of the invention or exploitation fees. In the event that universities or public administrations fail to make the determinations referred to in paragraph 2, they shall be entitled to thirty percent of the proceeds or fees.

c) See response to 3.8

References:

The Code for Industrial Property (legislative decree, February 10, 2005, n. 30), available at: http://www.uibm.gov.it/attachments/codice_aggiornato.pdf (Accessed on 21 August 2018).

Q.3.8. Which **reforms** to institutional autonomy have been important to enhance the impacts of public research?

In 2010, a comprehensive reform required Italian state universities to restructure their institutional governance by revising their statutes. The Law 240/2010 aimed to change the administrative board role from a democratic to a partnership model, while the dominant board model is now the stakeholder model (or, in several cases, quasi-democratic).
